

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAllister et al. (US 4,743,046) in view of Sasaki et al. (US 6,410,858).

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-2 and 4-7 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-2 and 4-7 of copending application No. 10/604,185. Applicants believe claim 1, as amended, no longer claims the same invention as claim 1 of copending application No. 10/604,185. Further, Applicants have canceled claims 1 and 2 from copending application No. 10/604,185.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections with the following arguments.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

The Examiner states that claim 1 is "rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAllister et al. [US 4,734,046] in view of Sasaki et al. [US 6,410,858]. McAllister et al. discloses a space transformer [figure 2] comprising: a multilayered circuit board; a power conductor [46]; a ground conductor [48], wherein the ground conductor is separated from the power conductor by an insulator [42]; at least one power pin [52, 70, 80]; at least one ground pin [54, 72, 82]; an auxiliary power/ground board [46, 48]; at least one auxiliary power/ground pins [90, 92]; at least one decoupling capacitor [74, 84] electrically connected to the power and ground conductors and mounted to the circuit board; a signal board [50]; and at least one signal pin [56] extending from the signal board. McAllister et al. discloses the instant claimed invention except for the arrangement of the decoupling capacitor. Sasaki et al. discloses a multilayered wiring board [112] with inductor element disposed therein comprising a capacitor [113], inserted between the source layer and the ground layer of the wiring board [figures 2-3], wherein the decoupling capacitor is in physical contact with the ground and source conductor. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the capacitor's arrangement of Sasaki et al. in McAllister et al. for the purpose of reducing size of the transformer."

Applicants contend that claim 1 is not obvious in view of McAllister et al. in view of Sasaki et al. because McAllister et al. in view of Sasaki et al. does not teach or suggest every feature of claim 1. In a first example, McAllister et al. in view of Sasaki et al. does not teach or suggest "an insulating body having a top surface and an opposite bottom surface and a cavity open to said bottom surface; through holes extending from said top surface of said body to said cavity."

Applicants point out that neither McAllister et al. or Sasaki et al. teach or suggest an insulating body having a cavity.

In a second example, McAllister et al. in view of Sasaki et al. does not teach or suggest (1) "said ground conductor contained within said cavity," (2) "said insulating layer contained within said cavity," (3) "said power conductor contained within said cavity," (4) "said first printed circuit board contained within said cavity," and (5) said second printed circuit board contained within said cavity."

Applicants point out that neither McAllister et al. or Sasaki et al. teach or suggest an insulating body having a cavity no less the ground conductor, insulating layer, power conductor and first and second printed circuit boards being "contained within said cavity" as Applicants claim 1 requires.

In a third example, McAllister et al. in view of Sasaki et al. does not teach or suggest (1) "a discrete ground conductor," (2) "a discrete insulator," and (3) "a discrete conductor."

Applicants point out that in McAllister et al. in FIG. 2 and col. 5, lines 10-13, ground 48, insulator 42 and power 46 are layers of a MLC fabricated using "conventional laminate technology: and are thus a single unit and not "discrete "components as Applicants claim 1 requires.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 1 is not unpatentable over McAllister et al. in view of Sasaki et al. and is in condition for allowance. Since claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 31-33 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 31-33 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: Hagois et al.

Dated: 07/05/2005

BY: Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Reg. No. 44,688
FOR:
Anthony M. Palagonia
Registration No.: 41,237

3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850
Agent Direct Dial Number: (802)-899-5460